



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,961	03/12/2004	Thomas Birkhoelzer	32860-000707/US	7715

30593 7590 01/15/2008
HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,961

Applicant(s)

BIRKHOELZER ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew L. Nalven

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-12 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. Applicant indicated that an updated IDS including dates for NPL references was included along with the response to office action. Examiner was unable to locate the updated IDS. Examiner respectfully requests the IDS be resubmitted.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. **Claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Kahn US Patent No. 7,185,192 in view of Ho US Patent No. 6,148,342.

2. **With regards to claims 1, 7,** Kahn teaches an electronic data processing facility adapted to run an operating system for configuring the data processing facility and an application program for editing data comprising (Kahn, column 12 line 48 – column 13 line 15) a data store for storing the data (Kahn, Figure 1 Item 350-3, column 19 lines 49-55, managed resource database), and a user object memory for storing user objects for authenticating and documenting access to the data (Kahn, column 18 lines 15-35, users accounts and user/groups/role identities, Figure 1 Items 350-1 and 350-2), and for storing an authentication user object which is assignable a data access right at the level of the operating system (Kahn, column 18 lines 35-45, identity of a role is determined) and which is assignable to a plurality of documentation user objects for authenticating the data access right to the documentation user objects (Kahn, column 19 lines 49-63, identity and role is combined with access type and resource identifier to make an access request which is authenticated). Kahn discloses a log and audit database but fails to disclose the specific functionality of a documentation memory for storing documentation data for documenting access to the data and the user object memory being further for storing documentation user objects storable in the documentation memory at the level of the application program for the purpose of documenting access to the data. However, Ho teaches a documentation memory for storing documentation data for documenting access to the data and the user object memory being further for

Art Unit: 2134

storing documentation user objects storable in the documentation memory at the level of the application program for the purpose of documenting access to the data (Ho, column 5 lines 21-43, log). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Ho's method of logging because it offers the advantage of improving security by allowing an auditor to determine if there are data access irregularities which would suggest an intruder attempted to or succeeded in accessing data (Ho, column 5 lines 21-43, log).

3. **With regards to claims 2, 8**, Kahn as modified teaches a security check is performed (Kahn, column 18 lines 20-25, login process and authentication) to identify a user prior to accessing the data (Kahn, column 18 lines 20-30, validates information from user, column 18 lines 36-40, identity is determined before request) and wherein a documentation user object and an authentication user object are assignable to a user on the basis of a result of the security check (Kahn, column 18 lines 25-35, user identifier and role are assigned).

4. **With regards to claims 4, 10**, Kahn as modified teaches the user object memory is connected to the data processing facility via a connection suitable for data communication (Kahn, Figure 1, column 12 lines 50-55).

5. **With regards to claims 5 and 11**, Kahn teaches a method for the processing of electronic data by a user using an electronic data processing facility, adapted to run an operating system for configuring the data processing facility and an application program editing the data (Kahn, column 12 line 48 – column 13 line 15) comprising: identifying the user as a documentation user object (Kahn, column 18 lines 15-20 and 35-45, user

Art Unit: 2134

accounts), identifying the user as an authentication user object (Kahn, column 18 lines 15-20, 35-45, and 51-64, role object provides for authentication of access requests), assigning the authentication user object a right to access data at the level of the operating system (Kahn, column 21 lines 4-21, objects may require a particular role for access, column 18 lines 15-35, role is assigned upon login) wherein a plurality of users are identifiable by the same authentication user object and are authenticable for the same data access right (Kahn, column 18 lines 15-20 and 35-45, role can identify a plurality of users). Kahn discloses a log and audit database but fails to disclose the specific functionality of a documentation memory for storing documentation data for documenting access to the data and the user object memory being further for storing documentation user objects storable in the documentation memory at the level of the application program for the purpose of documenting access to the data. However, Ho teaches a documentation memory for storing documentation data for documenting access to the data and the user object memory being further for storing documentation user objects storable in the documentation memory at the level of the application program for the purpose of documenting access to the data (Ho, column 5 lines 21-43, log). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Ho's method of logging because it offers the advantage of improving security by allowing an auditor to determine if there are data access irregularities which would suggest an intruder attempted to or succeeded in accessing data (Ho, column 5 lines 21-43, log).

6. **With regards to claims 6 and 12**, Kahn as modified teaches a storage medium on which information is stored adapted to interact with an electronic data processing facility in order to carry out the method of claim 5 (Kahn, Figure 1, column 19 lines 33-55, resource server, managed resources database).

7. **Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Kahn US Patent No. 7,185,192 and Ho US Patent No. 6,148,342, as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and in further view of Wood et al US Patent No. 6,892,307.

8. **With regards to claim 3 and 9**, Kahn as modified fails to specifically teach at least one of a device for checking biometric data, a device for checking at least one of a mechanical and electronic key and a device for checking a chip card to perform the security check. However, Wood teaches at least one of a device for checking biometric data, a device for checking at least one of a mechanical and electronic key and a device for checking a chip card to perform the security check (Wood, column 4 lines 38-50, evidence including retina, fingerprint, voiceprint, smart card, and keys). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Wood's method of authentication because it provides the advantage of multiple forms of authentication evidence thus allowing for multiple levels of trust to be established for a user based upon which authentication mechanisms are used (Wood, column 2 lines 29-44).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Gullotta et al US Patent No. 6,947,989 discloses a method for provisioning resources to users based on policies, roles, organizational information, and attributes.
10. High, Jr. et al US Patent No. 7,124,192 discloses a role permission model for security policy administration and enforcement.
11. Barkley et al US Patent No. 6,202,066 discloses an implementation of role/group permission association using object access type.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew L. Nalven whose telephone number is 571 272 3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrew Nalven
